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• Background

• Review process

• Technical studies

• Public consultation

• First Nations consultation

• Key issues to date
Jurisdiction: Fed/Prov Context

• 1963 Canada-BC Agreement transferred to BC most of the obligations and benefits of CRT

  “Canada shall…obtain the concurrence of BC before terminating the Treaty” (Article 4.2)
  “Canada shall…endeavour to obtain the agreement of the US on any proposal…which Canada and BC agree is in the public interest”

• Substance of Treaty deals largely with matters of provincial jurisdiction (natural resources management, hydro facilities)
Ministry of Energy, Mines and Natural Gas leads the CRT 2014 Review

- Coordination of provincial ministries
- Collaboration with Canada
- Consultation with First Nations
- Engagement of Basin residents
- Analysis of US interests and positions
Technical Studies

• Economic, environmental, social, financial, legal and hydrological analyses

• Modeling 3 main scenarios:
  • Treaty terminate, continue, enhance

• Determining full value of coordination across range of interests
Public Engagement

- 600 km² fertile land
- Communities
- Aboriginal cultural sites
- Ecosystems, fish and wildlife
- Agriculture, forestry, transportation, tourism
**Public Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education (CBT)</td>
<td>Fall 2011/2012</td>
<td>Improve understanding of Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Scoping</td>
<td>May-June 2012</td>
<td>Provide in-depth information on the Treaty and the review and decision making process. Facilitate discussion of values, interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input on Options</td>
<td>November 2012</td>
<td>Present trade-offs associated with different decision scenarios and seek public input on potential decision options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>Provide feedback to public on how input was considered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Engagement

• 7 community sessions in May-June 2012
• Local Government CRT Committee
• Website, blog, Twitter; soon Facebook
• Key issues:
  • Historical/footprint issues
  • Impacts from current operations
  • Opportunities to enhance environment
  • Infrastructure needs and economic development
  • Benefits to US
First Nations Consultation

- Ktunaxa, Shuswap and Okanagan First Nations
  - Identification of aboriginal rights and interests
  - Determination of potential impacts on rights

- Key issues:
  - Compensation for historical impacts
  - Ecosystem function – fish and wildlife
  - Archeological/cultural sites
  - Governance and revenue sharing
Relationship with US Entity

- Treaty proven to work well for power and flood protection
- Long history of collaboration and problem solving between Entities
- Ongoing and regular cooperation:
  - Assured Operating Plans: 6 years ahead – certainty of operation for both countries
  - Annual Operating Plan: changes made to realise additional benefits (power, fish, recreation)
  - Favourable commercial agreements - NTSA 2012
- Previous significant disputes resolved at the regional level
- Info sharing on respective CRT Review processes
Key Review issues - BC Perspective

- Founding principle – creating and sharing downstream benefits – recognized internationally
- CRT has worked well for power and flood values
- Called Upon Flood Control is undefined/uncertain
- CRT provides benefits in low flow years
- Flexibility allows for management of other values
- Ecosystems and adaptation to climate change are the new factors
- Coordination is key to responding to increasing demands
Questions?